27

28

1	Siving Energy (1911)		
2			
3	lucky.vidmar@hoganlovells.com Helen Y. Trac (Cal. Bar No. 285824)		
4	helen.trac@hoganlovells.com		
5	HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1500		
	San Francisco, California 94111		
6	Telephone: (415) 374-2300 Facsimile: (415) 374-2499		
7	Celine J. Crowson (pro hac vice)		
8	555 13th St NW		
9	Washington, DC 20004 Telephone: (202) 637-5600		
10	Facsimile: (202) 637-5600		
11	celine.crowson@hoganlovells.com		
12	Aaron S. Oakley (pro hac vice)		
13	1601 Wewatta Street, Suite 900 Denver, Colorado 80202		
14	Telephone (303) 899-7300		
	Facsimile: (303) 899 7333 aaron.oakley@hoganlovells.com		
15	Attorneys for Defendant Apple Inc.		
16			
17	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
18			
19			
20	STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.,	Case No. 3:16-cv-03582-WHA	
21	Plaintiff,		
22	V.	DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S RESPONSE TO THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE	
	APPLE INC.,	REGARDING FILING UNDER SEAL	
23	Defendant.	(DKT. 158)	
24			
25		Judge: Honorable Judge William Alsup	
26			

APPLE INC.'S RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE CASE NO. 3:16-CV-03582-WHA

In response to the Court's Order to Show Cause (Dkt. 158) related to the parties' requests to file documents under seal in connection with summary judgment briefing, Apple states as follows:

- 1. In the course of the briefing on Apple's motion for summary judgment of non-infringement, Apple has affirmatively sought to seal only a single document, Exhibit 11 to the Vidmar Declaration in Support of Apple's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 130). Other than this one exhibit, Apple is not seeking to seal any other Apple information.
- 2. In contrast to all the other Apple technical documents that Apple has submitted, this document contains sensitive nonpublic and proprietary information regarding specific reliability and delivery time aspects of APNS, as well as proposed technical solutions related to power usage, connectivity, storage, and wake/sleep behavior. The document also presents proprietary case studies related to Apple's investigations of APNS behavior, as well as results of specific tests and observations conducted by Apple of the operation of APNS under a variety of network conditions, including highly sensitive delivery time information. In addition to the technical testing and analysis information, the document also presents options and recommendations related to power usage of Apple devices, and enhancements to be made to device connectivity framework, storage, and power consumption, to improve the performance of APNS.
- 3. Before this litigation began, Exhibit 11 was internally marked by Apple as "Apple Confidential Do Not Distribute Not to be Used or Disclosed Without Permission from Apple." Apple produced it in this case under the highest confidentiality designation under the Protective Order.
- 4. In its Order granting Apple's motion for summary judgment, the Court did not cite Exhibit 11 or any discussion related to it in the parties' briefing.
- 5. Therefore, the public's ability to understand the merits of this case, including the Court's specific reasoning as to why Apple does not infringe, will not be affected if Exhibit 11 remains under seal.

1

- 6. Accordingly, Apple in good faith believes that Exhibit 11 should remain under seal pursuant to Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006), and the Court's Civil Local Rules.
- 7. All other requests to seal that Apple has filed, either in connection with its own motion for summary judgment (the remainder of Dkt. 130, as well as Dkt. 144) or in response to Straight Path's motion for summary judgment (Dkt. 134), relate to documents that <u>Straight Path</u> has designated under the Protective Order, and which Apple was obligated to file under seal pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(e), giving Straight Path the opportunity to file a declaration to confirm that the material should remain sealed.
- 8. With respect to Dkt. 130, Straight Path has filed a response stating that those documents "do not require sealing." Dkt. 132. Accordingly, under Civil Local Rule 79-5(e)(2), the Court can deny that administrative motion and Apple will file those documents (except the above-mentioned Exhibit 11) in the public record.
- 9. With respect to Dkt. 134, Straight Path has similarly notified the Court that no material requires sealing. Dkt. 140. Accordingly, once the Court denies that administrative motion, Apple will file all exhibits to Dkt. 134 in the public record.
- 10. Straight Path has not filed any declarations related to Dkt. 144. Accordingly, under Civil Local Rule 79-5(e)(2), the Court may deny that administrative motion and Apple will file all exhibits to Dkt. 144 in the public record.
- 11. Regarding Straight Path's requests to seal any document produced by Apple (administrative motions Dkt. Nos. 128 and 136), Apple has not sought to maintain any of those documents under seal. Accordingly, once the Court denies those administrative motions, Straight Path can file them in the public record, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(e)(2).

1	Respectfully submitted on November 20, 2017.	
2		
3	HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP	
4	/s/ Srecko "Lucky" Vidmar	
5	Clayton C. James (Cal. Bar No. 287800) clay.james@hoganlovells.com	
6	Srecko "Lucky" Vidmar (Cal. Bar No. 241120) lucky.vidmar@hoganlovells.com	
7	Helen Y. Trac (Cal. Bar No. 285824) helen.trac@hoganlovells.com HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP	
8	Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1500 San Francisco, California 94111	
9	Telephone: (415) 374-2300 Facsimile: (415) 374-2499	
11	Celine J. Crowson (pro hac vice) 555 13th St NW	
12	Washington, DC 20004	
13	Telephone: (202) 637-5600 Facsimile: (202) 637-5600	
14	celine.crowson@hoganlovells.com	
15	Aaron S. Oakley (pro hac vice)	
16	1601 Wewatta Street, Suite 900 Denver, Colorado 80202	
	Telephone (303) 899-7300	
17	Facsimile: (303) 899 7333	
18	aaron.oakley@hoganlovells.com	
19	Attorneys for Apple Inc.	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that on November 20, 2017, I filed a true and correct copy of the foregoing APPLE INC.'S RESPONSE TO THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE using the Court's CM/ECF electronic filing system which will serve the same upon all counsel of record. s/ Srecko "Lucky" Vidmar Srecko "Lucky" Vidmar